



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,174	04/07/2006	Yuki Miura	448252001600	6816
20872	7590	11/21/2011		
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 MARKET STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2482			EXAMINER STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/21/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

drcaldwell@mofo.com
EOfficeSF@mofo.com
PatentDocket@mofo.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/575,174	MIURA, YUKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KYLE STORK	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 21 October 2011.
2. Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 10, 13-14, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niyogi et al. (US 7197702, filed 13 June 2003, hereafter Niyogi) and further in view of Kobayashi et al. (US 2002/0095310, published 18 July 2002, hereafter Kobayashi).

As per independent claim 1, Niyogi discloses a system of one or more information devices, comprising:

- a memory for storing computer-readable instructions

- a processor for executing the instructions, wherein the instructions, when executed, causes the processor to function as:

- an information browser comprising:

- an acquisition unit which acquires document data described in a markup language (Figure 2; Figure 3, item 341: Here, a theme oriented text document is acquired)

- an analysis unit which analyses the acquired document data (Figure 2; Figure 3, items 341 and 342; column 7, line 50- column 8, line 21: Here, the theme oriented text document is parsed)

- a generation unit which generates a document-based layout tree containing layout information of the acquired document data based on result of the analysis (Figure 2; Figure 3, item 302; column 7, line 50- column 8, line 21: Here, a document-based layout tree, or theme control tree is generated)

- a rendering unit which makes a display of the acquired document data based on the generated document-based layout tree (Figure 3, item 365)

- a provider comprising:

- an acquisition unit which acquires information, wherein the information is not described in HTML (Figure 2; Figure 3, item 301; column 6, line 49- column 7, line 8: Here, a web page text document is acquired. The text document is written in ASP)

a generation unit which generates an information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information (Figure 2; Figure 3, item 302; column 9, Lines 38-49), wherein:

the information-based layout tree is different from the acquired document data (Figure 3, items 320 and 360)

the information-based layout tree is not analyzed by the analysis unit that analyzed the acquired document data (Figure 2: Here, the process branches after item 202. This indicates that separate processes are used to generate the web page class and the theme class)

the information-based layout tree is not generated by the generation unit that generated the document-based layout tree (Figure 2; Figure 3, items 315 and 355: Here, a separate parsing unit parses the web page text document and the theme oriented text documents)

a providing unit which provides the generated information-based layout tree to the rendering unit of the information browser without creating an HTML document (Figure 2; Figure 3, item 365; column 9, lines 21-37)

wherein the rendering unit makes a display of the information based on the information-based layout tree provided from the providing unit of the information provider (Figure 3, item 303; column 9, lines 21-37)

Niyogi fails to specifically disclose wherein the acquired information is device internal information not described in HTML. However, Kobayashi discloses wherein the acquired information is device internal information not described in HTML (Figure 6;

paragraphs 0061 and 0070-0073). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kobayashi with Niyogi, since it would have allowed a user to present device information in a visually appealing manner.

As per dependent claim 4, Niyogi and Kobayashi disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kobayashi further discloses wherein the device information provider further has a function of writing operation information, including at least one of setting information and a control instruction into the one or more information devices (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kobayashi with Niyogi, since it would have allowed a user to modify device settings.

As per dependent claim 5, Niyogi and Kobayashi disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kobayashi further discloses wherein the device information provider includes a device information interface which functions as an interface for receiving a request signal according to a prescribed procedure and executing the acquisition of the device internal information from the one or more information devices and the writing of the operation information according to the request signal (Figures 15-19).

As per dependent claim 7, Niyogi and Kobayashi disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kobayashi further discloses wherein the device information interface is connected to the one or more

information devices via a wired and/or wireless network and acquires the device internal information from the one or more information devices via the network (Figure 1; paragraph 0049). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kobayashi with Niyogi, since it would have allowed a user to monitor and display settings of device connected via a network.

As per claim 10, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 10 is similarly rejected.

As per claims 13-14, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 4-5, respectively. Claims 13-14 are similarly rejected.

As per claim 16, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 7. Claim 16 is similarly rejected.

As per claim 19, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claim 19 is similarly rejected.

6. Claims 2-3, 6, 11-12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niyogi and Kobayashi and further in view of Beranek et al. (GB 2329309, published 17 March 1999, hereafter Beranek).

As per dependent claim 2, Niyogi and Kobayashi disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Niyogi fails to specifically disclose wherein the device information provider has stylized data corresponding to the type of information device to be used as a base of the device information based layout tree display. However, Beranek discloses wherein the device

Art Unit: 2178

information provider has stylized data corresponding to the type of information device to be used as a base of the device information based layout tree display (column 8, lines 9-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Beranek with Niyogi, since it would have allowed a user to stylize web page data.

As per dependent claim 3, Niyogi, Kobayashi, and Beranek disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Beranek further discloses wherein the stylized data are prepared in multiple types corresponding to the types of the information devices (page 2, lines 9-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Beranek with Niyogi, since it would have allowed for display based upon the device type.

As per dependent claim 6, Niyogi and Kobayashi disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Niyogi fails to specifically disclose wherein:

the information browser and the device information provider are implemented in one information device

the device information interface acquires the device internal information of the one information device

However, Beranek discloses, wherein:

the information browser and the device information provider are implemented in one information device (Figure 4)

the device information interface acquires the device internal information of the one information device (Figure 4; column 8, lines 9-17)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Beranek with Niyogi, since it would have allowed a user to access internal information of a single device.

As per claims 11-12, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 2-3, respectively. Claims 11-12 are similarly rejected.

As per claim 15, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 5. Claim 15 is similarly rejected.

7. Claims 8-9 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niyogi and Kobayashi, and further in view of Henry et al. (EP 1286260, published 26 February 2003, hereafter Henry).

As per dependent claim 8, Niyogi and Kobayashi disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Niyogi fails to specifically disclose wherein the one or more information devices include at least one of a cellular phone, a home information appliance, and a vehicle-mounted device. However, Henry discloses wherein the one or more information devices include at least one of a cellular phone, a home information appliance, and a vehicle-mounted device (Figure 2; paragraph 0029). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Henry with Niyogi, since it would have allowed a user to obtain device settings about a specific type of device.

As per dependent claim 9, Niyogi and Kobayashi disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Niyogi fails to specifically disclose wherein the device internal information includes at least one of information on the types of the information devices and information on peripheral devices of each of the one or more information devices. However, Henry discloses wherein the device internal information includes at least one of information on the types of the information devices and information on peripheral devices of each of the one or more information devices (Figure 2; paragraph 0029). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Henry with Niyogi, since it would have allowed a user to obtain device settings for all devices within a system.

As per claims 17-18, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 8-9, respectively. Claims 17-18 are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2178

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178